

## REMARKS

### Introduction

The Office Action has withdrawn claims 24-28 from consideration, has objected to claims 6, 8-12, 23, 30 and 31, and has rejected claims 1-5, 7, 13-22, 29, and 32-41. The Office Action also has objected to the drawings.

Claims 2, 14-16, 22-28 and 40 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 17, 18, 21, 32, 34, and 39 are amended.

Claim 1 is amended to include the features of claims 2 and 16. Accordingly, claim 1 has the same scope as original claim 16.

Claim 8 is rewritten in independent form, and therefore, the scope of claim 8 has not changed.

In addition, claim 18 is rewritten in independent form and the features of claim 23 are incorporated into claim 18. Therefore, claim 18 has the same scope as original claim 23.

Accordingly, claims 1, 3-13, 17-21, 29-39, and 41 are pending and under consideration.

The Examiner's objections and rejections are traversed or obviated below, and consideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

### Objection To The Drawings

The Office Action objects to the drawings under 37 CFR Section 1.83(a), because the drawings do not show the circular arc being approximately 180 degrees or greater in claims 14 and 15. Claims 14 and 15 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

### Objection To Claim 32

The Office Action objects to claim 32 because the feature "the tilting bracket has two ends, each comprising accommodating part" appears twice in claim 32. Applicants amend claim 32 to correct this typographical error. Withdrawal of the objection to claim 32 is respectfully requested.

### Rejection Of Claim 33 Under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, because claim 33 recites "a second friction force" but does not recite "a first

friction force.”

It is respectfully submitted that claim 33 does not include the feature “a second friction force.” However, claim 34 includes this feature. Applicants amend claim 34 to delete the term “second” to obviate this rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection Of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 7, 13, 18, 21, 22, 29, 39 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,189,842 to Bergeron Gull et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Bergeron Gull”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants cancel claims 2, 22 and 40 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicants amend claim 1 to include the features of claims 2 and 16. It is noted on page 9 of the Office Action, “Bergeron Gull...does not specifically teach a body bracket detachably engaged to a rear of the display body and engaged to the pivoting bracket....” Therefore, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes from Bergeron Gull.

Claims 3, 4, 7, 13, 21, and 29 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features not taught or suggested by the cited reference. Therefore, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3, 4, 7, 13, 21, and 29 patentably distinguish over the cited reference.

Bergeron Gull does not disclose, teach or suggest at least, “a pivoting shaft, that projects from the pivoting bracket through the pivoting support bracket,” as recited in claim 5.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Office Action asserts that the tilt and swivel apparatus 200 of Figure 2A of Bergeron Gull teaches “pivoting hinge” as recited in claim 5. In addition, the Office Action asserts that pivot plate 204 of Figure 2A teaches the “pivoting bracket” as recited in claim 5. Further, the Office Action asserts that a shoulder screw 214 of Figure 2A teaches the “pivot shaft” as recited in claim 5. Lastly, the Office Action asserts that the second pivot plate 208 and cam member 218 of Figure 2A of Bergeron Gull teaches the “pivoting support bracket” as recited in claim 5.

However, shoulder screw 214 does not appear to project from pivot plate 204 through pivot plate 208 and cam member 218. Instead, a screw 216 engages a threaded aperture of shoulder screw 214, thereby sandwiching the pivot plate 204, the pivot bearing 206, the plate 208, the shoulder bearing 210 and the washer 212 (column 3, line 64-column 4, line 18). Thus, it

appears that the shoulder screw 214 only projects through washer 212 and into shoulder baring 210, which does not appear to pass through pivot plate 204. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 5 patentably distinguishes over the cited reference.

Claim 18 is amended to include features from claims 22 and 23. As noted, on page 13 of the Office Action, claim 23 contains allowable features. Therefore, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 18 patentably distinguishes over the cited reference.

Claim 39 is amended to include the features of claim 40 and features from claim 16. As noted on page 9 of the Office Action, "Bergern Gull... does not specifically teach a body bracket detachably engaged to a rear of the display body and engaged to the pivoting bracket." Therefore, claim 39 patentably distinguishes over the cited reference.

#### Rejection Of Claims 14 And 15 Under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergern Gull in view of U.S. Patent 5,997,493 issued to Young. Applicants cancel claims 14-15 without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested..

#### Rejection Of Claims 16, 17 and 41 Under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 16, 17 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergern Gull in view of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0075653 to Li. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Although claim 16 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 1 and 39 include the features of original claim 16.

Claim 17 is amended to depend from claim 1. Bergern Gull and Li taken separately or in combination do not disclose, teach or suggest at least, a body bracket detachably engaged to a rear of the display body, and engaged with the pivoting bracket, as set forth in claim 1 and similarly set forth in 39.

As shown in Figures 2A and 4, and disclosed in column 4, lines 20-22 of Bergern Gull, the display 102 is mounted to the pivot plate 204 utilizing apertures 226. Page 5 of the Office Action asserts that the pivot plate 204 teaches the pivoting bracket as recited in claim 16. However, in Bergern Gull pivot plate 204 is mounted directly to the flat panel display 102 and is not engaged with a body bracket.

The Office Action asserts that Li teaches a body bracket (unmarked) engaged with a pivoting bracket (turning joint 27). However, at best Li discloses an unmarked bracket engaged with an LCD 28 using fixing slots 271 and fixing units 272. Accordingly, Li does not disclose, teach or suggest at least, “a body bracket detachably engaged to a rear of the display body and engaged with the pivoting bracket,” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

Similarly, Bergern Gull and Li do not disclose, teach or suggest, at least, “a body bracket that has first screw holes, is detachably engaged to the display body, and is engaged to the pivoting hinge,” as recited in claims 39 and 41. Therefore, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted claims 39 and 41 patentably distinguish over the cited references.

#### The Rejection Of Claims 19 And 20 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergern Gull as applied to claim 18 above. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As indicated above, claim 18 is amended to include the features from claim 23. As indicated on page 13 of the Office Action, the Examiner notes that claim 23 includes allowable features.

Claims 19 and 20 depend from claim 18 and include all the features of that claim plus additional features, which are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 19 and 20 patentably distinguish over the cited references.

#### Rejection Of Claims 32-34 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergern Gull in view of U.S. Patent 6,164,611 to Kuhnke. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Bergern Gull and Kuhnke, taken separately or in combination do not disclose, teach or suggest at least,

“wherein when the tilting bracket engages the tilting support bracket, the bolt accommodating parts align and a screw bolt passes through the bolt accommodating parts to secure the tilting bracket and the tilting support bracket together, and rotate the display around the screw bolt, thereby tilting the display relative to the stand,” as recited in claim 32.

Instead, Bergern Gull discloses a tilt bracket 266 mounted to a hinge bracket member 256, preferably by screws (col. 4, lines 38-51).

A pivot plate 208 is tilted with respect to the hinge bracket 256 about an axis centrally disposed within the axle 268, which is not a screw bolt. In addition, the mounting of tilt bracket 266 to hinge bracket 256 does not teach passing a screw bolt through bolt accommodating parts to secure the tilting bracket and the tilting support bracket together, and rotating the display around the screw bolt so that the display may be tilted relative to the stand.

Kuhnke does not cure the deficiencies of Bergern Gull. Kuhnke and Bergern Gull teach entirely different systems for tilting a display. Further, Kuhnke does not disclose, teach or suggest inserting a bolt within a spring 270 of Bergern Gull. Inserting a bolt in spring 270 would simply have no purpose, because the display is not rotated around a spring.

Further, the feature "when the tilting bracket engages the tilting support bracket, the bolt accommodating parts align and a screw bolt passes through the bolt accommodating parts," is not taught in Bergern Gull. In fact, engagement of tilting bracket 266 and hinge bracket 256 does not cause any type of alignment of accommodating parts.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 32 patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

Claims 33-34 depend from claim 32 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 33-34 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

#### Rejection Of Claims 35-38 Under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 35-38 as being unpatentable over Bergern Gull in view of Kuhnke and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,347,433 to Novin et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Novin"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Novin does not cure the deficiencies of Bergern Gull and Kuhnke. Claims 35-38 depend from claim 32 and include all of the features of that claims plus additional features which are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 35-38 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Summary

Claims 1, 3-13, 17-21, 29-39, and 41 are pending and under consideration. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references taken separately or in combination disclose the present claimed invention.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

5/2/05

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Stephen T. Boughner  
Registration No. 45,317

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501